

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN

Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement

BAY AREA TO MERCED

AESTHETICS & VISUAL QUALITY TECHNICAL EVALUATION

January 2004

Prepared for:

California High-Speed Rail Authority

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal
Railroad
Administration**

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED TRAIN PROGRAM EIR/EIS

Bay Area to Merced Aesthetics & Visual Quality Technical Evaluation

Prepared by:

Parsons

January 2004

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Alternatives	2
1.1.1. No-Project Alternative	2
1.1.2 Modal Alternative	4
1.1.3 High Speed Train Alternative	7
2.0 BASELINE/AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	11
2.1 Study Area (0.25 Mile) defined	11
2.2 Existing Conditions and Future Baseline (General Description of Regional Landscape Features)	11
3.0 METHODOLOGY FOR VISUAL ANALYSIS	19
4.0 VISUAL IMPACTS	20
4.0.1 Typology: Central Valley Agricultural Landscape	20
4.0.2 Typology: Traditional Urban Town Center	20
4.0.3 Typology: Coastal Mountain	21
4.0.4 Typology: Urban Mixed-Use	22
4.0.5 Typology: Urban Industrial	23
4.0.6 Typology: Coastal Valley	24
4.1 No-Project Alternative	30
4.2 Modal Alternative	30
4.2.1 Highway Modal Alternative	30
4.2.2 Airport Modal Alternative	30
4.3 High-speed Train Alternative	31
4.3.1 San Francisco to San Jose	31
4.3.2 Oakland to San Jose	31
4.3.3 San Jose to Merced	32
5.0 REFERENCES	33
6.0 PREPARERS	34
APPENDIX A: VIEWPOINT LOCATION MAPS	35

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1: No- Project Alternative – California Transportation System	3
Figure 1.1-2: Modal Alternative – Bay Area-to-Merced Region	6
Figure 1.1-3a: High Speed Rail Alternative – Bay Area-to-Merced Region	8
Figure 1.1-3b: High Speed Rail Alternative – Bay Area-to-Merced	9
Figure 2.2-1: Location of Viewpoint 1	11
Figure 2.2-2: Viewpoint 1	12
Figure 2.2-3: Location of Viewpoint 2	13
Figure 2.2-4: Viewpoint 2	13
Figure 2.2-5: Location of Viewpoint 3	14
Figure 2.2-6: Viewpoint 3	14
Figure 2.2-7: Location of Viewpoint 4	15
Figure 2.2-8: Viewpoint 4	16
Figure 2.2-9: Location of Viewpoint 5	17
Figure 2.2-10: Viewpoint 5.....	17
Figure 2.2-11: Location of Viewpoint 6.....	18
Figure 2.2-12: Viewpoint 6.....	18
Figure 4.2-2: Visual Simulation with HSR: Viewpoint 2.....	21
Figure 4.2-3: Visual Simulation with HSR: Viewpoint 3.....	22

List of Tables

Table 1.1-1: Proposed Modal Alternative Highway Improvements Bay Area to Merced.....	5
Table 1.1-2: Proposed Modal Alternative Airport Improvements – Year 2020 Bay Area to Merced.....	5
Table 4.0-1: Detailed Analysis/Comparison Table/Potential Impacts to Visual Resources	25

Acronyms

AUTHORITY	CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL
CEQA	CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
COG	COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
EIR	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
EIS	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
EPA	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
FAA	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FRA	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
FTA	FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
MTA	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
RTP	REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) was created by the Legislature in 1996 to develop a plan for the construction, operation, and financing of a statewide, intercity high-speed passenger train system.¹ After completing a number of initial studies over the past six years to assess the feasibility of a high-speed train system in California and to evaluate the potential ridership for a variety of alternative corridors and station areas, the Authority recommended the evaluation of a proposed high-speed train system as the logical next step in the development of California's transportation infrastructure. The Authority does not have responsibility for other intercity transportation systems or facilities, such as expanded highways, or improvements to airports or passenger rail or transit used for intercity trips.

The Authority adopted a *Final Business Plan* in June 2000, which reviewed the economic feasibility of a 1,127-kilometer-long (700-mile-long) high-speed train system. This system would be capable of speeds in excess of 321.8 kilometers per hour (200 miles per hour [mph]) on a dedicated, fully grade-separated track with state-of-the-art safety, signaling, and automated train control systems. The system described would connect and serve the major metropolitan areas of California, extending from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego. The high-speed train system is projected to carry a minimum of 42 million passengers annually (32 million intercity trips and 10 million commuter trips) by the year 2020.

Following the adoption of the Business Plan, the appropriate next step for the Authority to take in the pursuit of a high-speed train system is to satisfy the environmental review process required by federal and state laws which will in turn enable public agencies to select and approve a high speed rail system, define mitigation strategies, obtain necessary approvals, and obtain financial assistance necessary to implement a high speed rail system. For example, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) may be requested by the Authority to issue a *Rule of Particular Applicability*, which establishes safety standards for the high-speed train system for speeds over 200 mph, and for the potential shared use of rail corridors.

The Authority is both the project sponsor and the lead agency for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. The Authority has determined that a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate CEQA document for the project at this conceptual stage of planning and decision-making, which would include selecting a preferred corridor and station locations for future right-of-way preservation and identifying potential phasing options. No permits are being sought for this phase of environmental review. Later stages of project development would include project-specific detailed environmental documents to assess the impacts of the alternative alignments and stations in those segments of the system that are ready for implementation.

The decisions of federal agencies, particularly the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) related to high-speed train systems, would constitute major federal actions regarding environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if the proposed action has the potential to cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed action in California warrants the preparation of a Tier 1 Program-level EIS under NEPA, due to the nature and scope of the comprehensive high-speed train system proposed by the Authority, the need to narrow the range of alternatives, and the need to protect/preserve right-of-way in the future. FRA is the federal lead agency for the preparation of the Program EIS, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are cooperating federal agencies for the EIS.

A combined Program EIR/EIS is to be prepared under the supervision and direction of the FRA and the Authority in conjunction with the federal cooperating agencies. It is intended that other federal, state,

¹ Chapter 796 of the Statutes of 1996; SB 1420, Kopp and Costa.

regional, and local agencies will use the Program EIR/EIS in reviewing the proposed program and developing feasible and practicable programmatic mitigation strategies and analysis expectations for the Tier 2 detailed environmental review process which would be expected to follow any approval of a high speed train system.

The statewide high-speed train system has been divided into five regions for study: Bay Area-Merced, Sacramento-Bakersfield, Bakersfield-Los Angeles, Los Angeles-San Diego via the Inland Empire, and Los Angeles-Orange County-San Diego. This Cultural Resources Technical Evaluation for the Bay Area – Merced Region is one of five such reports being prepared for each of the regions on the topic, and it is one of fifteen technical reports for this region. This report will be summarized in the Program EIR/EIS and it will be part of the administrative record supporting the environmental review of alternatives.

1.1 Alternatives

1.1.1. No-Project Alternative

The No-Project Alternative serves as the baseline for the comparison of Modal and High-Speed Train alternatives (Figure 1.1-1). The No-Project Alternative represents the state's transportation system (highway, air, and conventional rail) as it existed in 1999-2000 and as it would be after implementation of programs or projects currently programmed for implementation and projects that are expected to be funded by 2020. The No-Project Alternative addresses the geographic area serving the same intercity travel market as the proposed high-speed train (generally from Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego). The No-Project Alternative satisfies the statutory requirements under CEQA and NEPA for an alternative that does not include any new action or project beyond what is already committed.

The No-Project Alternative defines the existing and future statewide intercity transportation system based on programmed and funded (already in funded programs/financially constrained plans) improvements to the intercity transportation system through 2020, according to the following sources of information:

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for all modes of travel
- Airport plans
- Intercity passenger rail plans (California Rail Plan 2001-2010, Amtrak Five- and Twenty-year Plans)

As with all of the alternatives, the No-Project Alternative will be assessed against the purpose and need topics/objectives for congestion, safety, air pollution, reliability, and travel times.

**Figure 1.1-1:
No-Project Alternative – California Transportation System**



1.1.2 Modal Alternative

There are currently only three main options for intercity travel between the major urban areas of San Diego, Los Angeles, the Central Valley, San Jose, Oakland/San Francisco, and Sacramento: vehicles on the interstate highway system and state highways, commercial airlines serving airports between San Diego and Sacramento and the Bay Area, and conventional passenger trains (Amtrak) on freight and/or commuter rail tracks. The Modal/System Alternative consists of expansion of highways, airports, and intercity and commuter rail systems serving the markets identified for the High-Speed Train Alternative. Figure 1.2-2 shows the modal alternative for the Bay Area-to-Merced Corridor. The Modal Alternative uses the same inter-city travel demand (not capacity) assumed under the high-end sensitivity analysis completed for the high-speed train ridership in 2020. This same travel demand is assigned to the highways and airports and passenger rail described under the No-Project Alternative, and the additional improvements or expansion of facilities is assumed to meet the demand, regardless of funding potential and without high-speed train service as part of the system.

The additional improvements or expansion of facilities is assumed to meet the demand, regardless of funding potential and without high-speed train service as part of the system.

The Modal Alternative for the Bay Area-to-Merced region consists of two major sets of proposed improvements (see Figure 1.1-2):

- **Improvements to Highways:** Consisting of additional highway lanes to provide sufficient highway capacity and associated interchange reconfiguration, crossing bridge widening, ramp widening, cross street and intersection widening (Figure 1.1-2). Within the region, these improvements, therefore, would occur along proposed portions of Interstate (I) 5, I-880, I-580, I-80, and State Route (SR) 152. Table 1.1-1 lists the proposed highway improvements in the Bay Area-to-Merced region.
- **Improvements to Airports:** Primarily consisting of improvements to terminal gates and runways to provide sufficient landside and airside capacity and associated taxiways, ground access, parking, terminal and support facilities and airports that can serve the same geographic area and demand as the proposed High-Speed Train (HST) Alternative. Within the study area corridor, these proposed improvements would occur at San José International Airport and Oakland International Airport (Figure 1.1-2). Table 1.1-2 lists the airport improvements associated with the airports.

**Table 1.1-1: Proposed Modal Alternative Highway Improvements
Bay Area to Merced**

Highway Corridor	Segment (From – To)	No. of Additional Lanes ¹ (Total – Both Directions)	No. of Existing Lanes (Total - Both Directions)	Type of Improvement
Segment 1: Merced to San José				
SR 152	SR 99 to I-5	2	1-2	widening
SR 152	I-5 to US 101	2	1-2	widening
US 101	SR 152 to Gilroy	2	2-3	widening
US 101	Gilroy to I-880	2	2-5	widening
Segment 2: San José to San Francisco				
US 101	I-880 to Redwood City	2	4-5	widening
US 101	Redwood City to SFO	2	4-5	widening
US 101	San Francisco International Airport (SFO) to San Francisco	2	4-6	widening
Segment 3: San José to Oakland				
I-880	US 101 to Fremont/Newark	2	3-4	widening
I-880	Fremont/Newark to I-238	2	3-4	widening
I-880	I-238 to I-80	2	2-4	widening
Segment 4: I-580 to I-5 (via I-238)				
I-580	I-880 to I-5 (via I-238)	2	4-6	widening
Segment 5: San Francisco to Sacramento				
I-80	San Francisco to I-880	2	5-6	widening
I-80	I-880 to I-5 (Sacramento)	2	4-6	widening

¹ Represents the number of through lanes in addition to the total number of existing lanes that approximate an equivalent level of capacity to serve the representative demand.

**Table 1.1-2: Proposed Modal Alternative Airport Improvements – Year 2020
Bay Area to Merced**

Airport Name	Additional Gates	Additional Runways
San José International Airport	14	one
Oakland International Airport	19	one

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, November 2002